



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
HEALTH AND CONSUMER PROTECTION  
Directorate C - Scientific Opinions  
Unit C2 - Management of Scientific Committees; scientific co-operation and networks

Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment

Brussels,  
C2/JCD/csteep/DinpENV30102001/D(01)

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON TOXICITY, ECOTOXICITY AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT (CSTEE)**

**Opinion on the results of the Risk Assessment of:**

**1,2-Benzenedicarboxylic acid, di-C8-10-branched alkyl esters, C9-rich and  
di-“isononyl” phthalate**

**CAS No.: 68515-48-0  
and  
CAS No.: 28553-12-0**

**EINECS No.: 271-090-9  
and  
EINECS No.: 249-079-5**

**REPORT VERSION (Environment):  
Final report, May 2001**

**Carried out in the framework of Council Regulation (EEC) 793/93 on  
the evaluation and control of the risks of existing substances<sup>1</sup>**

**Opinion expressed at the 27th CSTEE plenary meeting**

**Brussels, 30 October 2001**

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 793/93 provides a systematic framework for the evaluation of the risks to human health and the environment of those substances if they are produced or imported into the Community in volumes above 10 tonnes per year. The methods for carrying out an in-depth Risk Assessment at Community level are laid down in Commission Regulation (EC) 1488/94, which is supported by a technical guidance document.

## Terms of reference

In the context of Regulation 793/93 (Existing Substances Regulation), and on the basis of the examination of the Risk Assessment Report the CSTEE is invited to examine the following issues:

1. Does the CSTEE agree with the conclusions of the Risk Assessment Report?
2. If the CSTEE disagrees with such conclusions, the CSTEE is invited to elaborate on the reasons for this divergence of opinion.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

The environmental part of the document is of good quality, but it suffers from a lack of data on the specific compound, therefore most conclusions are extrapolated from related compounds (DEHP, DIDP, etc.).

In absence of specific data for this chemical, the RAR follows the recommendations of the TGD. However, the CSTEE considers that several of the assumptions and recommendations suggested by the TGD cannot be directly applicable to compounds such as DINP, with a log Kow of 9, a water solubility of 0.6 µg/l and which is highly persistent in soil and sediment.

Nevertheless, for the aquatic environment, there is enough evidence, on DINP or related compounds, supporting the conclusion of negligible risk related to waterborne exposures. Therefore, the CSTEE agrees with conclusion (ii) for the aquatic compartment related to direct exposures from water, which is basically the route covered by the TGD.

However, the risk of exposure from contaminated food, cannot be excluded for fish and invertebrates, including those grazing on plankton and on other invertebrates and fish. The experimental BCF of 4000 in mussels for DIDP, used also for the DINP assessment, was obtained for water concentrations of 4-41 µg/l, clearly above the solubility limit of 0.2 µg/l, therefore the CSTEE questions the validity of this figure. On the basis of the simple equations to estimate the BCF from the Kow, it is also to be expected that the BCF is much higher. Based on these considerations the CSTEE is of the opinion that additional information and a proper model for assessing the food-web transfer is required.

In addition, considering the estimated persistence in sediments, a long-term PEC for sediment, assuming a regional river-basin model, when contaminated sediment is expected to move slowly downstream reaching the estuary, should be considered and a monitoring programme should be implemented. Sediments can be a source of the chemical for other environmental compartments, and this process must be taken in consideration.

For the terrestrial environment, information is inadequate, in particular with such a high volume chemical (more than 100000 t/a of production, with estimated soil release of more than 2500 t/a in Europe) with high potential for soil accumulation and for bioaccumulation.

Due to the uncertainties in determining PEC and PNEC, the CSTEE does not agree with conclusion (ii) for the terrestrial environment and secondary poisoning. Information is needed for a more reliable assessment of the PNEC for terrestrial organisms and of the concentration in biota, including a proper model for covering the potential for biomagnification through the food chain.

In addition, the problems observed by the CSTEE regarding the potential underestimation of the bioconcentration and bioaccumulation of this chemical may have consequences for the risk characterisation for humans exposed through the environment.

Moreover, it is the opinion of the CSTEE that a risk assessment should also be performed on the most relevant metabolite (monoisononylphthalate).

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

### **Exposure assessment**

DINP is a low soluble, low volatile, highly lipophilic compound, therefore compartments more likely to be exposed are soil and sediments.

The available data suggest that DINP should be in theory easily metabolised by living organisms (from micro-organisms to vertebrates). However, the very high binding potential may drastically reduce the bioavailability of the chemical to the enzymatic machinery of the living organisms. This phenomenon may be observed both in the environment (resulting in persistence in soil and sediment) and within the organism (resulting in high levels in biota). The results is that a theoretically “readily biodegradable” chemical has a very high persistence in the environment, and that high concentrations are observed in biota (including 7 marine mammals) for a chemical with a theoretically short depuration rate.

For these compartments experimental data on degradation are not available, therefore, half life values as high as 300 days for soil and aerobic sediments and 3000 days for anaerobic sediments were extrapolated from DEHP. These figures seem to be confirmed by soil monitoring data of DINP. Therefore, DINP is likely to have a high accumulation potential in soil and sediments.

No data are available on the most relevant metabolite (monoisononylphthalate).

Due to lipophilicity and low depuration rate, DINP has a high bioaccumulation potential in animals. The PECs are carefully calculated according to the TGD, at continental, regional and local level, taking into account different release scenarios. Very few monitoring data are available. In this case too, extrapolation from DEHP experimental data has been performed.

## **Effect assessment**

### *Aquatic organisms*

Acute toxicity effects were never observed on aquatic organisms at water saturation level of DINP. Data on long term effects on fish exposed via water are not available on DINP. Nevertheless, a large amount of information is available on long term effects on fish (including reproductive effects) for several C6-C11 phthalate esters. All these data seem to indicate no effects at solubility level. A two-generation feeding test on fish showed no effects on reproduction at a DINP concentration in food of 20 mg/kg.

Due to the lack of reliable NOECs, a PNEC<sub>water</sub> was not calculated in the RAR, and the CSTEE agrees that with the available information a PNEC<sub>water</sub> cannot be estimated. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that no effects on aquatic organisms exposed via water, are expected. However, this estimation does not cover aquatic organisms exposed via food, as included in the risk characterisation.

Tests on sediment dwelling invertebrates and on early life stage of amphibians (egg hatching, tadpole survival and malformations) gave no effects at the highest concentrations tested (3000 and 1010 mg/kg dw respectively). Due to the lack of reliable NOEC, a PNEC<sub>sediment</sub> was not calculated. The CSTEE also agrees that a PNEC<sub>sediment</sub> cannot be estimated from the available data.

### **Terrestrial organisms**

Short-term toxicity data are available for soil dwelling organisms. However, the derivation of a PNEC<sub>soil</sub> from short-term tests is not acceptable for this chemical, considering its long-term presence in the environment and its bioaccumulation potential. The CSTEE considers that long-term tests are required.

From mammalian studies a PNEC<sub>oral</sub> of 150 mg/kg in food is calculated according to a NOAEL of 88 mg/kg. Nevertheless, a more restrictive NOAEL of 12 mg/kg bw/d has been suggested by the CSTEE (opinion on human health assessment). Therefore, a PNEC<sub>oral</sub> of 24 mg/kg food should be assumed, with appropriate corrections for the daily food intake depending on the species.

## **Risk characterisation**

Even if a PNEC<sub>water</sub> was not calculated, the CSTEE agrees with the conclusion that adverse effects on aquatic organisms exposed through water are unlikely.

A potential risk for fish exposed through contaminated food can be estimated from the data, but it has not been indicated in the RAR. A NOEC of 20 mg/kg food (feeding rate 5% body weight per day) may not be protective when compared to the estimated PEC<sub>fish</sub> or measured concentrations in aquatic organisms, which are close to or higher than this NOEC.

For sediments maximum environmental concentrations approach or are similar to the highest tested concentrations in short-term sediment toxicity tests. Considering the high persistence in sediments and the scarce toxicity information, the CSTEER considers that a long-term risk for sediment dwelling organisms cannot be excluded, and therefore conclusion (ii) is not acceptable.

Due to the uncertainties in determining PEC and PNEC for soil and food chain, conclusion (ii) for the terrestrial ecosystem is not acceptable. Similarly, conclusion (ii) is not acceptable for the atmosphere. Additional information, and particularly long-term toxicity tests and proper model estimations for bioaccumulation and biomagnification are required.